

Vol. 15 No 5 May 1990

Edited, printed and published at Liverpool
 by Dr J. Pinsent & Ms Helena Hurt, BA
 Dept of Classics and Archaeology, The University,
 P.O. Box 147 Liverpool, L69 3BX, Tel. 051-794-2455
 RATES for 1990, 10 issues (not August and September)
 UK & Europe, £15.00, elsewhere \$US 30.00
 Retired & Student, £110.00 or \$US 20.00

CONTENTS of which the authors retain the copyright.
 The editor retains copyright in the format



- Brian Arkins** (Galway): *A note on Virgil, Eclogues 10.4-6* 66
A.J. Barron (Ilfracombe): *Afterthoughts on Sirius at Manilius 1.407-9* 67-69
G.B.A. Fletcher (Gosforth): *On Seneca's Agamemnon, Thyestes and Hercules* 69-72
Donald Norman Levin (Rice U., Houston): *Echoes of Roman Poetry in Laclos'* 72-74
Les liaisons dangereuses.
 Review discussion: **James Diggle** (Queens' College, Cambridge) 74-79
 Thomas Cole, *Epiploke: Rhythmical Continuity and Poetic Structure in Greek Lyric*. The Department of the Classics, Harvard University (distributed by Harvard University Press), 1988. Pp. xv + 267. ISBN 0-674-25822-3.
W. Geoffrey Arnott (Leeds): *KOPAE* 80
C.J. Simpson (Wilfrid Laurier, Waterloo, Ontario): *The drama of Catullus 7* 80

The lateness of 'this number of *LCM*' enables the Editor to include the sad news of the death from cancer of John Creed of Lancaster, who had joined the Department of History when that of Classics was recently closed. If anybody feels moved to write an appreciation he would be happy to print it.

Recipients of the April 'number of *LCM*' may have wondered at the increasing amount of information displayed on the envelope, especially that sent overseas, and the Editor thought he might decode it for them. In the top left hand corner is, of course, the return address, under which the Editor had been advised to put AIR MAIL for these numbers being sent overseas, to avoid the unfortunate mis-franking that led to the delay in the arrival of the January number. It may be that, now the Post Office have given *LCM* its own Airstream franking stamp, the other will no longer be necessary. The large type number in the bottom left hand corner is *LCM*'s Post Number; every Department (or rather, as they are now called, Budget Centre) has been assigned a number, in order that it may, in due course, be directly charged for its postage (which *LCM* has of course been paying anyway) and the Post Room have been instructed to refuse all mail not so numbered. This is part of the implementation of the Government's new policy for Universities, which is to make them and their constituent parts 'responsible', which is likely to have all sorts of consequences, perhaps unintended, perhaps not.

On the address label there are two figures, one of which is preceded by a letter on numbers sent overseas. That, in the top right hand corner, is our Post Number, of which the letters refer to areas. A is Australia, B Canada, D South Africa, E the United States and F Europe, C is everywhere else, e.g. New Zealand (both parties will be pleased that this is not assimilated to Australia), Israel, Chile and Japan. The other number, below the Post number on the right hand is the SUBSCRIPTION NUMBER which it is most helpful if correspondents would always quote. The journal, unlike the other publishing activities of *LCM*, does generate an enormous amount of administration, and anything that subscribers can do to help reduce it will in the long run benefit them, by making the organisation more efficient.

Finally a word about claims, addressed really to Libraries rather than to personal subscribers (indeed we can hardly recall ever having had a claim from one of those), though the latter may be able to bring these remarks to the attention of the former. Libraries often claim at the end of the year, when they are binding up and discover that some numbers are missing, for reasons which they probably know as well as the Editor suspects, and for which he does not think it fair that *LCM* should have to pay. The solution is to say that claims must be made immediately on receipt of the next number: claims made at the end of the year, or later still if that is when takes place, will be regarded as replacement orders which will have to be paid for.

It seems that the Editor is not unaffected by the new financial atmosphere to be felt in universities. Will he need a new logo, a dragon perhaps instead of



Brian Arkins (Galway): *A note on Virgil, Eclogues 10.4-6*

LCM 15.5 (May 1990), 66

At the beginning of his tenth and final Eclogue, Virgil addresses the nymph Arethusa and asks her to inspire this poem, which is written for his friend Gallus. The reference to Arethusa is appropriate because, after her escape from Alpheus, she appeared as a spring in Sicily, the home of Theocritus, Virgil's mentor in the genre of pastoral poetry. But a more complex literary reference is to be found here.

To advance the argument, it is first necessary to consider another crucial *Eclogue*, 6. At the beginning of *Eclogue* 6, Virgil adapts Callimachus' motif of Apollo dissuading the poet from writing epic, in order to assert that his pastoral poetry is Callimachean in nature (lines 3-8; note especially the key terms of approbation *deductum . . . carmen* and *tenui . . . harundine*, which correspond to Callimachus' *λεπταλέος*: see W.Clausen, *Virgil's Aeneid and the Tradition of Hellenistic Poetry*, [Berkeley/Los Angeles/London 1987], 3). Later in *Eclogue* 6, Gallus appears as the author of love poetry, symbolized by the water imagery of *Permessi ad flumina* (line 64; cf. Propertius 2.10.25-26), and of Callimachean-type aetiological poetry, derived from Callimachus' follower Euphorion (lines 72-77; see R.Coleman, ed., *Virgil – Eclogues*, [Cambridge 1977], *ad loc.*)

It would, therefore, be entirely appropriate, if in his last composition in pastoral poetry, in which Gallus is extremely prominent, Virgil combined references to Gallus, Callimachus and water (for water as a symbol of poetry see A.Kambylis, *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik*, [Heidelberg 1965]; note Crowther, *Mnem.* 32 [1979], 1-11. Neither Kambylis, nor Crowther, nor Coleman [*op.cit.*] advert to the point made in this note). And so, I believe, it proves to be at lines 4-6.

Virgil's poem about Gallus and his affair with Lycoris is to be inspired by Arethusa on one condition (cf. Coleman *ad* 9.30): that, when she flows beneath the Sicilian sea, her mother Doris does not intermingle her sea waves with Arethusa's fresh water. Now at the end of Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*, Apollo advises that the Assyrian river, which contains much filth and refuse, is to be avoided by poets and that a sacred spring, which is pure and undefiled, is to be cultivated (lines 108-112). Furthermore, in Propertius 3.3.23-24 Apollo tells the poet to avoid the middle of the sea, which is occupied by *maxima turba*, a horde of poets writing epic poetry; cf. Propertius 3.9.3 *quid me scribendi tam vastum mittis in aequor?*

Combining these passages, we can see that Virgil at *Eclogue* 10.4-6 is varying a Callimachean motif. The source of Virgil's poem, Arethusa, will be pure and undefiled, that is, properly Callimachean, and will not be tainted by the open sea, that is, the voluminous flow of epic poetry. And the point is made with appropriate *doctrina* because the adjective *Sicanus* is used here for the first time (Coleman *ad loc.*; cf. the rivers Po and Satrachus in Catullus 95, with W.Clausen in K.Quinn, ed., *Approaches to Catullus*, [Cambridge/New York 1972], 277).

A.J.Barron (Ilfracombe): *Afterthoughts on Sirius at Manilius 1.407-9*

LCM 15.5 (May 1990), 67-69

After traditional remarks about the star, and lines about its supposed influence on Earth for war or peace, Manilius seems to say:

*magna fides hoc posse color currusque micantis
ignis ad os. vix sole minor, nisi quod procul haerens
frigida caeruleo contorquet lumina vultu.*

In his discussion in LCM 12.1 (Jan.1987, 10-11, P.J.Bicknell suggested that *caeruleus* in line 409 need not mean 'blue', and he sought a 'junk sense', OLD's sense 11, for Man.1.409 (which OLD prudently omitted). To keep it extra company there, he suggests taking Ov.*Met.*15.789 from sense 9 ('dusky'). 'Dusky' is wrong for the Ovid. But so is 'heavenly' at sense 11. It belongs at sense 1, which however needs expanding to include 'bluish-white' for many stars and some planets (it is an attribute of subject, *not* complement, in the Ovid line). Two silver Latin instances at sense 11 could be otherwise dealt with¹, leaving it empty. It is no help to our Manilius line.

There is a long dispute about the colour of Sirius in antiquity. Bicknell has shown that most Latin authors wrote of it as red. This would fit a red giant Sirius B, not the very bright blue-white Sirius A. Red giants are now known to become white dwarfs at some stage, and Sirius B is now an optically invisible white dwarf. But astronomers dispute how long such conversion would have taken.

A and B are in mutual orbit of about a 50 year period. If, as a literary hypothesis, Sirius B was a red giant in antiquity, it would have been in orbit with our Sirius A. Whatever the predominant luminosity, Sirius A would have contributed some blue (or bluish-white) at some phases of mutual orbit. The Romans would not have understood how or why.

Avienus (about A.D.360), in two separate lines adduced by Bicknell as if to belittle the anomaly, writes at one point of the star's redness, at another of its blueness. Perhaps Manilius also does so. *ignis ad os* is the reading of A.E.Housman, who discusses how he chose it². That the colour of fire is red is also plausible. In any case, from *nisi* onwards, Manilius seems to limit his first remark about colour, and to qualify it in respect of a blueness. I do not dispute Bicknell's reasoning that the text implies a main redness, and that this was associated by the Romans with war.

The ancients were interested in Sirius (and in a few other bright stars) as marking the seasons by its risings and settings (each twice a year). In a recent article³ Pinsent has shown how Hesiod used such star lore, and how some of it fits an agricultural calendar. Manilius seems to start his mention of Sirius in this general tradition. His Greek source was the Cilician Aratos, whom he has in mind when he mentions Mt Taurus. It seems to me that the top of Mt Taurus was often above the weather, and would therefore enable an astronomer to discover more about Sirius than he could from ground level. Aratos was also a source for Cicero, and for Germanicus, and for Avienus, each of whom has some common but some individual points about Sirius. This seems true also of Manilius., whatever his extra source. He is concerned with the 'influence' of Sirius on mortal affairs more grandiosely than was Hesiod for his farmers.

¹ The compilers of the lemma *caeruleus* in OLD used a separate sorting niche for the 'caerulean' two-horse chariot of the moon (*Ciris* 38) and for the 'caerulean' horses of the sun (Sen. *HF* 132), for workaday reasons – hence our sense 11. They could have gone to sense 1 with a 'cf. hyperb.'. But the two Silver Latin writers were arguably psychedelic. Some 20th century writers would take blue horses in the sky in their stride.

² The footnotes in Housman's *Manilius I* are relatively short, but its Introduction deals at length with making sense of the text at specimen points, of which I think his *ignis ad os* (from *in radios*) was one.

³ J.Pinsent, 'Boeotian Calendar Poetry', in Hartmut Beister & John Buckler (eds.), *Boiotika. Vorträge 5. Internationalen Bötien-Kolloquium zu Ehren von Professor Dr. Siegfried Lauffer*, München 1989, 33-37.

A classicist tends to expect internal coherence of subject matter, leading to a Ciceronian peroration. But when an astronomer becomes an astrologer, this may no longer apply. Bicknell perhaps assumed that Manilius, having started with a seasonal rising of Sirius, had summer and winter in mind, in any references to fire and to cold in lines 407-9. But this seems to me *tame*. Would it have told the Romans very much, by looking at Sirius if they ever did so, very much that they couldn't have worked out from the *Acta Diurna* without looking at the sky? My own impression of the lines is that Manilius is out to make an *extra* point which is not explainable in terms of what had gone before.

I digress now to mention not Hesiod but Virgil's *Georgics* – and line 1.453 of these:

caeruleus (color solis) pluviam denuntiat, igneus Euros.

Part of this line appears amid *OLD*'s sense 9 ('dusky') of *caeruleus*. It is there misattributed to Statius – but by the printer, not by the compilers, a 'reader corrigible' error, for *OLD* is both a *κτῆμα ἐς δελ* and a stimulus. *OLD* here glosses that blue is the colour of the colour. It is not in fact the colour of the sun, but that of the sky that Virgil asks farmers to watch. When there is a red sky at night we know, as he did, that this is 'the shepherd's delight', and that the morrow will be dry. *igneus* is thus distinguished from all the other colour bands in the spectrum, for which Virgil uses the word *caeruleus* (really here as a cf. if it stays at sense 9 – modern colour photos show yellow cloud effects, green ones, light blue ones, dark blue ones, indigo ones, all heralding rain). Thus Housman's *ignis ad os* (qualifying *color* in Man.1.408) seems apt for an ancient red Sirius B (however impossible this may seem to astronomers). It seems distinguished, by the *nisi* from a blue (*caeruleus*) face (*vultus*) of variant (*contorquet*) cold light. The ancients thought blue stars were cold. They are, in fact, hotter than red ones.

Is the *os* ('mouth') *co-extensive* with the *vultus* ('face') or only part of it? Manilius (if the word is his) could have thought of mouth as the snout of the constellation and as the focal point within Sirius itself as an orifice from which flames pulsed. That the *vultus* has a different colour seems to me a clue that someone used by Manilius (as a lost source) looked at Sirius for a long-term or slow variation of colour effects (*not* for the split-second scintillation which Sirius A shows for *no* intrinsic reason *but* because its brightness causes a prism effect as its rays enter the Earth's atmosphere).

I am told that some Arabs, in antiquity, saw Sirius as a double, that is, as two stars. If with the naked eye, it seems unlikely that one star could have been our present blue-white dwarf Sirius B which requires high-powered telescope (I have not yet been able to pin down and date the Arab source).

The maximum separation of the two present stars of the binary is eleven *seconds of arc* at a distance of eight or nine light-years from viewpoint. The brightness of Sirius A spoils visual separation within the first four seconds of arc, leaving only seven seconds (so far as I interpret) for the rest of ellipse of orbit. If the ancient Sirius B were a red giant, it could hardly have been visually distinct from our very bright Sirius A (or vice versa) at most points of mutual orbit. The testimony of certain ancient Arabs may have been the result of a lucky viewing when one star was at extreme turning point of any ellipse. By contrast, popular astronomy lists nine (or so) binaries, all of which are at a much greater distance than Sirius, but in which by use of a modest telescope a faint member can be seen as well as a bright one, and these as points of a different colour, for instance the green companion of the red giant Antares. By comparing the distances and angles of vision it can be shown by geometry that visual separation is far more plausible with such stars of different colour in far-off binaries.

The comparative nearness and hypothetical brightness of both members of an ancient Sirius pair lend credence to a confusion of the colour issue by the ancients. The result of Man.1.408, as the text stands, carries over the *color* (in effect *igneus*) as the implied subject (antecedent) which *procul haerens contorquet* cold light with (or from) a blue face. I don't admire the Latin and could offer an emendation. But it is possible (and here a duty) to keep it as a *tour de force* of compressed synecdoche, in which the *part* (the red colour) does duty (punctuation apart) for the *whole* which includes a blue face. The Romans didn't know that there were two stars causing the phenomenon. Manilius' syntax lets us beg the question. If it construes jerkily, so does any thread of topics in an astrological oracle.

So much for the text. That my scenario is not that of many modern astronomers is a paradox. Many have been most kind in giving me sight of articles on their own measurements and reasonings. That evidence from literary style favours an ancient red Sirius B is a mystery – perhaps a technical impossibility. I try to mediate between *OLD* and Bicknell, in favour of a complex ancient scenario in which two colours, red and blue, may have mingled and varied in ways more interesting than merely seasonal or predictable. I'd call it kaleidoscopic. I think that the red predominated for Horace and for most Latin writers. It suited the association of Sirius' summer rising with a season of excessive heat.

My speculation led me to browse through some colour photos inset in a fold-out from the *National Geographic Magazine* of June 1983. In the region of the Horsehead Nebula in one photo I noticed a white star surrounded by a vast cloud of blue stellar gas which it was emitting. On the colour plate this was offset by a background of red luminosity from some other source. I traced the photo to the Edinburgh Observatory, the Information Officer of which has been most kind in confirming it. It cannot prove that Sirius A behaved in such a way in antiquity: it merely gave me to think.

Meanwhile in *Reader's Digest* for August 1989 I read about an observatory at Puimichel in the south of France used by visiting astronomers for its often clear skies. This was used by a Hamburg astronomer in September 1988 for studies of a binary, a red giant in orbit with a white dwarf, to measure the emission of clouds of stellar dust when the two stars were in line of vision for spectroscopic analysis (I didn't discover whether the clouds were detectable visually). The astronomer most kindly sent me a copy of his article on his measurements of loss of mass (very slow) by such stars influencing one another, as detected by spectroscopic analysis of emitted ions of various elements. I am most grateful to Dr Klaus-Peter Schroeder – and do not wish to misinvolve him in my own conclusions.

There is no evidence that a red Sirius B, if it could have existed in classical times, could have emitted detectable clouds of red stellar gas – or Sirius A of blue gas. But if they ever had done so, any kaleidoscopic effect could have been sensational – and could have justified astronomers climbing to the top of Mt Taurus to spot what any new appearance of Sirius was bringing of unexpected pattern – and astrologers using this to try to forecast patterns of peace or war.

I must thank the Loeb translator of Manilius, Professor G.P.Goold, not only for his great kindness in explaining his own translation of lines 407-9 without seeming to take sides, but also for supplying me with much past evidence of articles in astronomy journals on the past history of Sirius, and theories about the star. And I must thank Oxford helpers for leading clues, including excerpts from Aratos, Cicero and Germanicus. My suggestions here are my own.

Copyright © 1990 A.J.Barron

G.B.A.Fletcher (Gosforth): *On Seneca's Agamemnon, Thyestes and Hercules*

LCM 15.5 (May 1990), 69-72

Some corrections and additions are given here to the valuable commentaries on Seneca's *Agamemnon* and *Thyestes* by R.J.Tarrant and on *Hercules* by J.G.Fitch.

Agamemnon.

15 *corpus euinctus rotae*. For the accusative Tarrant quotes Virg. A.5.269 and Sil.2.341. Cf. Virg. E.7.32, A.5.774, 8.286, Tib.1.7.6, Ov.M.15.675-6. For the object to which a person or thing is affixed he quotes Gell.14.1.3 and 20.1.54. Cf. Ov.P.3.2.7 *euincti eminas ad sua terga manus*.

27 *uiscera*. In prose Tarrant quotes Quint.6.pr.3. Earlier cf. Curt.6.14.72.

44 *iam iam natabit sanguine alterno domus*. For *iam iam* Tarrant quotes Virg. A.6.602, Ov.M.1.535, Sen.Med.949, Tro.1141. There are examples in Plautus, Terence, Catullus, Caesar and Tacitus. For *natabit* Tarrant quotes Virg. A.3.625-6 *sanie . . . | aspersa natarent limina*. Cf. Cic. Ph.2.105 *natabant pauimenta uino*.

51-2 *quid ipse temet consulis, torques, rogas an deceat hoc te?* Cf. Cic. Att. 10.15.2 *torqueor utrum ventum exspectem*, Ov. Ep. 9.36 *torqueor infesto ne uir ab hoste cadat*, Sen. Contr. 7.pr.3 *numquam se torsit quomodo diceret*.

78 *dedit in praeceptis*. Cf. Livy 27.27.11, Sen. D. 3.7.4.

82 *sanguinolenta*. Tarrant says that only here does Seneca use this word. He uses it also in Ep. 66.50 and De Ben. 7.10.4.

84 *nimias . . . domus*. Tarrant quotes for *nimius* from Tacitus and Claudian. Cf. Sall. H. 2.53 *fiducia nimius* and Livy 6.11.3 *nimius animi*.

87 *aram uacent*. Cf. Prop. 2.25.8 *parma uacat*, Gratt. 487 *arma . . . uacantia*, Luc. 5.327 *tela uacabant*, 8.823-4 *uacarent arma*.

88 *sidunt ipso pondere magna*. Tarrant says that Seneca uses *sido* only here and at 501. He uses it also in D. 2.2.2 *ciuitatis . . . pessum sua mole sidentis* and 6.24.5.

98 *pastus . . . uagos*. Cf. Apul. M. 5.25.3.

106 *timidus . . . mari credere cumbam*. For *timidus* with an infinitive cf. Hor. Carm. 3.192, 4.9.52-3, Vitr. 6.1.4, Sil. 16.574.

117 *impos*. Tarrant says that this word is found once in Accius. It is found in *trag.* 287 and *carm.* fr. 9.

120 *trabe*. Tarrant quotes Catullus, Horace and Ovid but not Virg. A. 3.191 or 4.566.

133 *mixtus dolori subdidit stimulos timor*. Tarrant quotes Livy 6.34.7 *risus stimulos animo subdidit* but not Lucr. 6.604 *subdit . . . hunc stimulus . . . timoris*.

171 *uela fecerunt*. Tarrant gives no note. Cf. Cic. Verr. 5.88 *uela fieri*, Tusc. 4.9 *uela facere*, Virg. A. 5.282 *uela facit*.

209 *procacem . . . manum*. Cf. Plin. NH. 14.10 *procacibus bracchiis*, 28.17 *procaces manus*.

211 *bello mora*. Cf. Sil. 1.479 *belli mora*.

215 *aequorei dei*. Tarrant quotes Ov. M. 12.72 *proles Neptunia Cycnus* but not 197 *aequorei . . . dei*.

223-4 *et tota captae Dardaniae domus regesta Danais*. Tarrant mentions Sen. Phaedra 720 *regeramus ipsi crimen* and adds that he can compare only Hor. Sat. 1.7.29 *expressa arbusto regerit conuicia*. Cf. Sen. Contr. 10. pr. 6 *magna exempla in caput inuenientium regerunt*, Plin. Ep. 6.22.4 *crimina . . . regessit*, 10.19.2 *culpam hi in illos, illi in hos regere posse confidunt*, Quint. 11.1.22 *inuidiam . . . in eum regeret*, Tac. H. 3.78.3 *dum regerit inuidiam crimen meruit*.

237 *circuit pallor genas*. For *circuit* meaning 'spreads over' Tarrant quotes Stat. T. 10.115-6 *tenuis qui circuit aulam | inualidusque nitor* and Silu. 4.4.26 *sonus geminas mihi circumit aures*. Cf. Sen. Ben. 4.21.6 *uiuum corpus circumeat* (sc. *ignis*).

258 *maritam . . . domum*. Tarrant offers five examples of *maritus* as an adjective but not Livy 27.31.5 *maritas domos*.

425 *ad militares remus aptatur manus*. Tarrant knows *apto ad* elsewhere in poetry only in Ov. Am. 1.13.14. Cf. Stat. A. 2.129-30 *ad ensiferos . . . tumultus aptabar*.

435-6 *iuuat uidere nuda Troiae litora, iuuat relictis sola Sigei loca*. Tarrant cites Ov. Ep. 1.33-4 *haec est Sigea tellus, hic steterat Priami regia celsa senis*. Cf. Virg. A. 2.27-8 *iuuat ire ad Dorica castra | desertosque locos litusque relictum*.

449 *iacente . . . salo*. Tarrant cites for *iacente* Lucan, Valerius Flaccus and Silius Italicus but not Ovid M. 11.747 *iacet unda maris*.

460 *colla releuabat iugo*. Cf. Ov. Am. 1.6.25 *longa releuare catena*.

509 *remus effugit manus*. Tarrant compares Sen. Oed. 380 *uiscera effugiunt manum* but not Virg. A. 2.793 *manus effugit imago* or Cic. Rep. 6.12 *si impias propinquorum manus effugeris*.

501 *alterna uice*. Tarrant cites Ennius but not Plin. NH. 345.29.

567 *tardam . . . ratibus Aulida*. Cf. Luc. 5.236 *iniquam classibus Aulin*.

688 *turritae*. Tarrant cites Virg. A. 6.785, Ov. M. 10.696 and Claud. Rapt. 3.271 but not Prop. 4.11.52.

707 *induit uultus feros*. Tarrant says 'possibly imitated by Martial 2.42.13-14 *uultus indue . . . seueros*'. Cf. Virg. A. 1.684 *notos . . . indue uultus*, Ov. Am. 3.14.27 *indue . . . metuentem crimina uultum*.

715 *oculi . . . rigent*. Tarrant compares Plaut. Men. 923 *solent tibi umquam oculi duri fieri?* and Sen. Oed. 187 *oculi . . . rigent*. Cf. Plin. NH. 23.69 *oculis rigentibus*, Suet. Nero 49.4 *exstantibus rigentibusque oculis*, Virg. A. 7.447 and Ov. M. 14.754 *deriguere oculi*.

721 *mentis inopem*. Cf. Virg. A.4.300 *inops animi*, Ov. Ars 1.465 and 3.684 *mentis inops*.

726 *ubi sum? fugit lux alma et obscurat genas*. Cf. Virg. A.3.311-12 *si lux alma recessit*, | *Hector ubi est?* Tarrant gives no example of *obscurat* 'blinds'. Cf. Plaut. Trin.666-7 *amorem tibi pectus obscurasse*, Plin. NH.8.99 *uisu obscurato*, Mart.14.5.1 *ne tristes obscurant lumina cerae*.

796 *ne metue*. Tarrant mentions *ne* with an imperative in Catullus, Propertius and Ovid but not in Horace and Virgil.

800 *excutiat deam*. Cf. Virg. A.6.79 *excussisse deum*.

Thyestes

4-5 *siti arente*. Tarrant quotes Ov. Am.3.7.51 *sic aret mediis taciti uulgastor in undis* but not Ep.4.174 *arentem* . . . *sitim* or Tib.1.4.42 *arenti* . . . *siti*. Cf. Lucr.6.1175 *sitis arida* and Ov. M.11.129 *sitis arida*.

29-30 *nec uacet cuiquam uetus odisse crimen*. Tarrant quotes Ov. M.6.585 *nec fklere uacat* and on 593 he quotes Ov. M.5.334 *nec nostris praebere uacet tibi antibus aures*. Cf. Cassius ap. Cic. Fam.12.13.2 *quominus tibi uacet me excipere*, Virg. A.1.373 *uacet annalis nostrorum audire laborem*, 10.625 *hactenus indulsisse uacat*, Livy 28.43.21 *Graecas fabulas enarrare uacat*.

132 *aduertat placidum numen*. Cf. Hor. Epod.5.53-4 *in hostilis domos iram atque numen uertite*, Virg. A.4.611 *meritum* . . . *malis aduertite numen*, Ov. T.2.2223 *lusibus* . . . *aduertere numen ineptis*.

137 *sicci* . . . *Tantali*. For *siccus* meaning 'thirsty' Tarrant quotes Ov. F.3.304 but not Plaut. Pers.822 or Hor. S.2.2.14.

165 *accendant* . . . *famem*. Cf. Cels.3.6.1. *sitim accendit*.

180-81 *fremere* . . . *armis orbis*. Cf. Virg. A.4.229-30 *bello* . . . *fremetem Italiam*.

281-2 *ante oculos meos imago caedis errat*. Cf. Ov. T.3.4.57 *ante oculos errant domus urbsque*.

481-2 *fidem foedusque iungent*. Cf. Livy 1.28.9 *fidem ac foedera seruare*, 5.51.10 *foedus ac fidem fefellerunt*, Stat. T.12.378 *iunge fidem*.

536 *influentis dona fortunae*. Cf. Vitruv.1.2.9 *ex possessionibus rusticis influunt fructus*.

540 *respuere certum est regna consilia mihi*. Tarrant quotes Ov. M.9.684 *certa sua est Ligdo sententia* but not Plaut. Epid.163 *senem oppugnare certumst consilium mihi*.

547 *potens mentis*. Tarrant quotes Livy 9.14.5 *suarum impotens rerum* but not 23.16.6 *potentes rerum suarum* or Ov. T.2.139 *mentis* . . . *potenti* or Curt.7.4.3 or 7.4.19 *potens mentis*.

589 *pelagus recumbit*. Cf. Hor. Carm.1.12.32 *unda recumbit*.

596-7 *dolor ac uoluptas inuicem cadunt, breuior uoluptas*. Cf. Prud. Perist.14.107 *nunc triste longum, nunc breue gaudium*.

727 *adicit* . . . *fratri*. Cf. Val. Fl.1.823 *addunt* . . . *tuis*.

920 *pectore* . . . *hebetata*. Cf. Ov. P.4.1.17 *hebetantem pectora Lethen*.

962-3 *credula praesta pectora fratri*. Cf. Cic. Att.15.16 *me* . . . *praebeo credulum*, Sen. N Q 4.b.4.1 *me usque ad mendacia haec leuiora* . . . *credulum praesto*.

972 *solidam* . . . *pacis alliget certae fidem*. Cf. Plaut. Merc.378 *solida* . . . *fides*, Tac. H.2.7.1 *solida fide*.

973 *satias dapis me nec minus Bacchi tenet*. Tarrant speaks of 'a more elevated way of saying *satis habeo*'. He refers to Ter. Hec.594-5 *satias iam tenet studiorum istorum*. Cf. also Ter. Eun.403-4 *sicubi eum satietas | hominum aut negoti siquando odium ceperat*, Lucilius 810 *quid mihi proderit quam satias iam omnium rerum tenet*, Livy 30.3.4 *si forte iam satias amoris in uxore ex multa copia eum cepisset*.

1004 *expedi amplexus*. For this meaning of *expedi* cf. Sen. Ep.88.20 *non perducunt animum ad uirtutem sed expediunt*.

1060 *in parua carpsi frustra*. For *carpere in* cf. Livy 3.61.13, 26.38.2.

Hercules

93 *ultra nocentem exilia*. Fitch calls *exilia* a striking metaphor. For *exilia* meaning 'places of exile' cf. Ov. F.1.540 *exilium cui locus ille fuit*.

161 *spes immanes*. Fitch quotes Ov. *M.* 5.678 *studium . . . immane* and Stat. *T.* 12.167-8 *immanis . . . impetus*. Cf. Stat. *T.* 12.281 *uotum immane*.

329 *minas uultu gerens*. Cf. Stat. *T.* 1.188 *gerit ore minas*, Phaedr. 1.13.7 *quantum decoris . . . uultu geris*, Val. Max. 3.1.ext.1 *in uultu confusionem gereret*.

391 *manat . . . lapis*. The stone drips tears. Fitch says 'from Ov. *M.* 6.312 *lacrimas . . . marmora manant*'. But there is no *lacrimas* here. He does not correct the remark that this is the earliest instance of the verb so used absolutely. Cf. Ov. *M.* 5.634 *manat locus*.

415 *ures pepulit*. Cf. Cic. *Orat.* 177 *animos hominum auresque pepulissent*

475 *smyrna*. With Fitch's note cf. Valerius in Ribbeck *Com. Romanorum . . . Frag.* p.367.

604-6 *in poenas meas . . . non satis terrae patent Iunonis odio*. Cf. Ov. *T.* 3.10.77-8 *tam late pateat cum maximus orbis*, | *haec est in poenam terra reperta meam*.

621 *membra laetitia stupent*. Cf. Curt. 8.4.12 *hic calor stupentia membra commouit*.

946 *morsus parat*. Cf. Ov. *M.* 7.786 *uanos exercet in aera morsus*, 13.568 *rictu . . . parato*, Stat. *T.* 5.169 *clusos . . . concurrere morsus*.

Copyright © 1990 G.B.A. Fletcher

Donald Norman Levin (Rice U., Houston): *Echoes of Roman Poetry in Laclos' Les liaisons dangereuses*. LCM 15.5 (May 1990), 72-74

Les liaisons dangereuses, the elegantly written and fascinating-to-read epistolary novel from the pen of Pierre-Ambroise-François Choderlos de Laclos, affords a close look at pampered late-eighteenth-century French high society practically on the eve of the Revolution. The text itself understandably looks back here and there to Voltaire and Rousseau, both of whom are even quoted directly. And in individual letters reference is made to such earlier epistolary novels as Rousseau's *Julie, ou la nouvelle Héloïse* and Richardson's *Clarissa Harlow*.

At the same time, however, Laclos' text is affected by rare, yet significant reminiscences of Classical antiquity. Apart from passing reference to Hannibal at Capua and to Socrates among friends, I detect at least three sets of what appear to be deliberate echoes of verses set down originally in Latin.

I. Laclos and Terence

'*Songez*', writes the putative creator of Letter 74, '*que rien de ce qui l'intéresse ne m'est étranger*'. Whereas the antecedent of the earlier of the two elided pronouns may be somewhat ambiguous, there can be little doubt that the statement itself counts as an adaptation of a verse – or at least part of a verse – assigned by the comic poet Terence to the *senex* Chremes

homo sum: humani nihil a me alienum puto HT 77

The person, however, who adapts the Terentian original to eighteenth-century realities is not a male oldster, but a woman in her prime, namely the clever, witty, charming, beautiful, and altogether manipulative Marquise de Merteuil. And it is to the hardly less charming and hardly less manipulative Vicomte de Valmont (a former lover eager to become lover once again) that the Marquise addresses her borrowed explanation of her own penchant for interfering in the lives of others.

II. Laclos and Catullus

One of the few actions in *Liaisons* of which the Marquise is *not* instigatrix is the Vicomte's campaign to seduce the beautiful, but also virtuous and devout Madame de Tourvel, whose jurist spouse conveniently happens to be absent from first page to last, just as the Comte

de Gercourt, designated fiancé of Cécile Volanges, the teen-age ingénue whom the Marquise would prefer that the Vicomte seduce (her being a kinswoman of the Marquise appears to be no impediment), stays away all through the novel and is represented only by a lone letter not to Cécile herself, but to her mother. Ultimately the Don Juanesque Vicomte seduces Cécile and Madame de Tourvel both, yet sees more merit in debauching the young matron than in debauching the even younger ingénue, for the challenge posed by the former's more firmly held beliefs was the greater.

Along the way, however, the experienced philanderer falls in love with the more mature of the two women he has most recently committed himself to wrong. Or at least such is the impression which his behaviour produces upon his old friend the Marquise.

The situation is actually somewhat more complicated than that, as the Vicomte attempts to explain to the Marquise in a paragraph set down midway through Letter 100:

Mais quelle fatalité m'attache à cette femme? Cent autres ne désirent-elles pas mes soins? Ne s'empresseront-elles pas d'y répondre? Quand même aucune ne vaudrait celle-ci. L'attrait de la variété, le charme des nouvelles conquêtes, l'éclat de leur nombre, n'offrent-ils pas des plaisirs assez doux? Pourquoi courir après celui qui nous fuit, & négliger ceux qui se présentent? Ah! pourquoi? . . . Je l'ignore, mais je l'éprouve fortement.

I am conscious here of at least two distinct, yet interconnected Catullan echoes. The question of why the Vicomte, with his proven record of successful debauchery, should chase after someone who seeks to avoid his amorous advances cannot help but call to mind Catullus' advice to himself in the aftermath of an apparent rupture with the *puella* whom practically every observer is ready to equate with Lesbia/Clodia:

nec quae fugit sectare, nec miser uive. 8.10

Similarly the Vicomte's confession that he cannot explain why he behaves as he does, yet is conscious of the power of the experience, cannot help but call to mind the statement of the poet from Verona that he knows not why he feels what he feels, yet is tormented by the feeling itself:

nescio, sed fieri sentio et excrucior. 85.2

Catullan too – keyed even to the very epigram of which I have just cited the lone pentameter – is the opening sentence of the next paragraph of Letter 100

*Il n'est plus pour moi de bonheur, de repos, que par la possession
de cette femme que je hais et que j'aime avec une égale fureur.*

Clearly Laclos' Vicomte is echoing 85.1: *odi et amo* . . . And that in itself is ironic. For the ill-fated Madame de Tourvel, whose goodness and whose kindness have as much to do with her downfall as does her long-repressed amorousness, is about as different a creature from Lesbia/Clodia (the presumed target of Catullus' simultaneous love & hatred) as can be imagined. That the susceptible and vulnerable bride of the continuously absent jurist should be loved by such a reprobate as the Vicomte is understandable enough. That she should be hated is understandable only in the case of one so governed by *amour-propre* and so little inclined to be governed by *amour d'autrui* as was the Vicomte himself.

Let it be granted, however, that the Vicomte is not one hundred per cent scoundrel. He frequently displays generosity – and not always out of ulterior motive. Certainly he is forgiving towards his sometime friend and sometime rival, the young Chevalier Danceny (which latter proves romantically inclined towards Cécile and the Marquise both), even after the latter has wounded him in a duel.

III. Laclos and Horace

Even in the *Préface du rédacteur*, counterfeited by Laclos himself as a somewhat facetious adjunct to the one hundred and seventy-five letters which constitute the novel proper, a literary echo from ancient Rome is quite discernible. '*Le mérite d'un ouvrage*', we read at the start of the sixth paragraph, '*se compose de son utilité ou de son agrément, et même de tous*

deux, *quand il en est susceptible*.' Is it not obvious that Laclos as pseudo-*rédacteur* is echoing certain verses of Horace's *Ars Poetica*?

aut prodesse *volunt* aut delectare *poetae*,
 aut simul et iucunda et idonea *dicere uitae*. 333-4
omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci,
lectorem delectando pariterque monendo. 343-4

Copyright © 1990 Donald Norman Levin

Review discussion; **James Diggle** (Queens' College, Cambridge) LCM 15.5 (May 1990), 74-79
 Thomas Cole, *Epiploke: Rhythmical Continuity and Poetic Structure in Greek Lyric*. The Department of the Classics, Harvard University (distributed by Harvard University Press), 1988. Pp. xv + 267. ISBN 0-674-25822-3.

This is a remarkable book. It proposes that we reject traditional ways of understanding and demarcating the units of composition used by writers of Greek lyric and that we replace them with an entirely new system. The argument is complex, is informed with great learning, and is illustrated by exhaustive analysis of the poetical texts. The style in which the argument is expressed is often abstruse, though never quite impenetrable. The relentless detail and the remorseless prose will ensure that few readers stay the course. But the book demands to be read in whole not in parts, since the argument is cumulative. An editor who is prepared to embrace the new system which the book advocates will not only analyse the texts differently from hitherto; he will adopt new ways of setting them out on the page; and he will adopt new criteria for judging what to print, and what not to print, in his text.

I begin with a paraphrase of the argument of the early pages, offering *φωνδεντα*, as I hope, *δυνετοῖσιν*, unlike the book itself. Ancient metrical theorists (Cole tells us) may be divided into two camps: 'metrists' and 'colometrists'. For the former, such as Hephaestion, the metron was the minimal structural element of composition, and consisted of 9 or 10 trisyllabic or tetrasyllabic forms, whose combination would account for even the most recalcitrant verses: so that, to take one example, the metrist held that the asclepiad was based on three 'antispastic' metra (~ - - ~). Colometrists, such as Terentianus Maurus, found the basic unit of composition in the colon, and traced all cola back to segments of the dactylic hexameter or iambic trimeter: so that the colometrist held that the asclepiad was based on the two halves of the pentameter. For both metrists and colometrists, Greek lyric was a mosaic of discrete pieces, of isolable units. Modern colometrists adopt the same theoretical approach, and have formulated a range of basic elements, which, subject to modification, amplification, and curtailment of various kinds, are the building blocks of lyric verse.

But there is also Heliodorus (1st century A.D.), who paves the way to another system. He observes that certain rhythmical types stand in a particularly close relationship to each other. In each instance the related types are those which may be generated from each other by the transference of a long or short from one end of the foot or metron or series of feet or metra to the other end. Thus the dactyl - ~ ~ is related to the anapaest ~ ~ -, the iambic metron x - ~ - to the trochaic metron - ~ - x, the pure choriambic dimeter - ~ ~ - - ~ ~ - to the ionic ~ ~ - - - ~ ~ - -, the iambo-choriambic sequence - ~ ~ - x - ~ - to the anacreontic ~ ~ - x - ~ ~ -. The 'interweaving' of these related metrical types appears to have been given the name *ἐπιπλοκή*.

'Surviving reports of the theory ... are meagre enough that it is difficult to know exactly what to make of it', says Cole. 'Modern scholars have tended to make very little of it indeed.'

The term, and the theory, are absent (if a glance at their indexes tells the right tale) from Wilamowitz's *Griechische Verskunst*, White's *The Verse of Greek Comedy*, and the handbooks of Maas and West. Cole cites A. M. Dale, *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama* 41, who calls *ἐπιποκὴ* 'an occasional phenomenon in Greek metric'. Dale in fact mentions it a few times more (Cole refers to her *Collected Papers* 49-50, 95; see also *LMGD* 70, 120, 147), but only in relation to iambic/trochaic, dactylic/anapaestic, choriambic/ionic.

She infers that Heliodorus' concern was simply 'the fact that, e.g. in the same infinite series $x - \sim - x - \sim - x - \sim \dots$, it is possible to mark off both iambic and trochaic segments, in $\sim \sim - \sim \sim - \sim \sim - \sim \sim \dots$ dactylic and anapaestic, and so on' (*LMGD* 41 n. 1). But, says Cole, whatever ancient theory may have meant by *ἐπιποκὴ*, the metaphor of 'interweaving' makes perfect sense. 'Rhythm is a single fabric in which rise and fall are constantly being interwoven through a pattern of alternating or cyclical recurrence.'

As a simple illustration he cites *Ar. Equ.* 551-5 = 581-5, where word-end creates a series of verbal demarcations which differ from each other in strophe and antistrophe: the rhythm appears to be unambiguously iambo-choriambic in the strophe, and almost as unambiguously anacreontic in the antistrophe. For the (colo)metrist, Aristophanes' rhythm must be either iambo-choriambic or anacreontic; it cannot be both. The notion of *ἐπιποκὴ* resolves the dilemma. 'The interwoven or interlocking elements of epipoke are probably as practical a means as any of suggesting the phenomenon of undemarcated recurrence'. With this we need not quibble. A few pages later Cole offers two more illustrations. In *E. Hyps.* I.ii.9-13 = I.iii.11-16 (Cole's line numbers are inexact) verbal demarcations suggest a dactylic pattern in the strophe, an anapaestic one in the antistrophe. And in *S. OT* 1088-97 = 1100-1109 they suggest 'mostly trochaic combined with prosodiac ... in the strophe and iambic in the same combination in the antistrophe'. Here the sceptic might not so readily assent. He might reply that it is in Euripides' manner to write long stretches of dactylic verse which do not admit of segmentation into regular patterns of dimeters and tetrameters and the like, as, for example, *Held.* 615-18 = 626-9, where we have the choice of analysing as $3 + 3 + 5$ dactyls (so Dale, *LMGD* 39), in order to secure coincidence of word-end and line-end, or (what I regard as preferable, since a dactylic trimeter is not a regular unit of composition) of analysing as two tetrameters, with neglect of colon-diaeresis, followed by clausular $\sim \sim - \sim \sim - \sim \sim - \sim \sim$. *Ba.* 165-9 is another passage which does not admit regular segmentation of dactyls (Dale analyses as $3 + 2 + 4 + 5$). And neither in *Held.* nor in *Ba.* does verbal demarcation tempt us to think in terms of anapaests. In relation to the Sophoclean passage, the sceptic, if he belongs to the school of Maas, may question why we should be thinking in terms of iambic and trochaic rhythm at all, rather than in terms of cretics and ancipites.

The argument proceeds as follows. The basic units of Greek verse contain at least 3 and not more than 8 quantities (longer sequences being analysable as compounds of shorter types). If we leave out of account the single 5-quantity unit (the dochmiac $x - - x -$) and the single 6-quantity unit (the anapaestic monometer $\sim \sim - \sim \sim -$), both of which recur in continuous series as isolable units of composition, we find that, for each attested unit of 3, 4, 7 or 8 quantities, there is another, linked to it in 'Heliodoran' fashion, and that the rhythms thus represented by these pairs comprise almost all the ways of arranging 3, 4, 7 or 8 quantities into a cyclically recurring pattern without violating a fundamental rule of Greek versification – the rule which prescribes that a long must alternate with a single short, a double short, or an anceps. It emerges that, of the 15 theoretically permissible pairs containing 3, 4, 7 or 8 quantities, 11 are found as the basis of continuous rhythmical movement as follows:

- 3-quantity pairs ('triadic cycles') $\sim \sim -$ and $- \sim \sim$;
 $- \sim -$ and $\sim - -$;
 4-quantity ('tetradic cycles') $x - \sim -$ and $- \sim \sim - x$;
 $- \sim \sim -$ and $\sim \sim - -$;
 7-quantity ('heptadic cycles') $x - \sim \sim - \sim \sim -$ and $- \sim \sim - \sim \sim - x$;

8-quantity ('octadic cycles')

- ~ - x - ~ - and ~ ~ - x - ~ - -;
 - ~ - - ~ - - and ~ ~ - - ~ - -;
 x - ~ - x - ~ - and - ~ - x - ~ - x;
 x - ~ ~ - ~ - and - ~ ~ - ~ - x;
 - x - ~ ~ - ~ - and x - ~ ~ - ~ - -;
 - x - x - ~ ~ - and x - x - ~ ~ - .

These, then, are the basic units out of which lyric verse is 'interwoven'. *ἐπιπλοκή* may interweave a related pair from the same cycle or unrelated pairs from different cycles, in which case transitional segments are involved. A simple example of the interweaving of a related pair is S. OT 487-8 = 501-2 ~ ~ - - ~ ~ - - ~ ~ - - ~ ~ - , which conventional colometry would call catalectic ionics, but which Cole prefers to call 'iono-choriambic' (ionic at the beginning, choriambic at the end; to put it another way, ionic if you read forwards, choriambic if you read backwards). Or take [A.] PV 128ff. = 144ff. Here editors have long disputed the claims of alternative colometries, some isolating the initial x - ~ - - |, where sense-break coincides with word-break, and proceeding with ionics, and, for the most part, achieving coincidence between word-end and colon-end, others dividing in mid-word at x - ~ - | and proceeding with aeolo-choriambic rhythm and, for the most part, failing to achieve coincidence between word-end and colon-end. Arguments in favour of the former analysis are offered by G. Zuntz, *Drei Kapitel zur griechischen Metrik* (1984) 59-94, in favour of the latter by M. Griffith, *The Authenticity of Prometheus Bound* (1977) 25-33, to neither of whom Cole refers. Griffith, in his commentary ad loc. (p.112), writes: 'An interesting counter-rhythm is set up by the process of "dovetailing", whereby word-division regularly overlaps colon-division by one syllable. Thus we find in this stanza that word-division would suggest another colometry ... This ambiguous effect is not uncommon.' *ἐπιπλοκή* is, again, a reasonable way of glossing the phenomenon. Indeed, in discussing the similar dilemma posed by PV 397ff. = 406ff., both Dale (*LMGD* 147) and Griffith (*Authenticity* 29) invoke the term. The question at issue, then, is not whether the concept of *ἐπιπλοκή* has any validity. We have seen that conventional colometrists are prepared to make use of it. The questions to be asked are: How wide is its validity? Is it helpful to apply it in circumstances other than the fairly simple metrical contexts so far illustrated? Is Cole justified in his 'elevation of *ἐπιπλοκή* to a cardinal principle of Greek versification'?

The simple structure so far proposed is developed, and becomes increasingly complicated, in the chapters which follow. Cole devotes the remainder of Part I of the book to separate chapters on 'Tetradic Rhythm', 'Prosodiac and Heptadic Aeolic', 'Octadic Aeolic' and 'Antispastic, Dochmiac, Bacchio-cretic'; and in Part II he traces the development of 'Epiploke in the History of Greek Verse', from the beginnings to Hellenistic times. A large amount of lyric is analysed. Segments which act as transitions between units from different cycles are defined. The narrative is decorated by diagrams and dissected by tables of verse-forms. Traditional terminology is discarded; a new terminology supervenes. Old friends depart. Farewell ithyphallic and dactylo-epitrite. Farewell glyconic, telesillean, and dodrans, and all the goodly company of aeolo-choriambics. Make way for aeolo-ionic, iono-trochaic, trochaeo-choriambic, trochaeo-prosodiac. And prepare for the late arrival of aeolo-antispastic.

I shall pick out some of the novelties proposed and indicate some of my doubts.

Cole argues that - ~ - is always 'a "trochaeo-iambic" - ~ -', (i.e. a cretic) or syncopated trochaic - ~ - , never syncopated iambic ~ - ~ - . If his argument is right, it will follow that, when | - ~ - stands in initial position in any sequence, that sequence cannot be regarded as iambic. This has serious consequences. But what is the basis for this argument? Cole claims that a syncopated quantity is always supplied by 'protraction' of an adjacent syllable, and that such 'protraction' is always supplied by the syllable preceding the syncopated quantity and never by the syllable following it. He finds evidence for this claim in the observation that an iambic sequence such as ... ~ ~ | ~ - ~ - , where resolution precedes syncopation, is prohibited, whereas a sequence such as ... ~ - ~ - | ~ ~ ~ - , where syncopation

precedes resolution, is permitted. That the former is prohibited, while the latter is permitted, makes sense, he suggests, only if we suppose that a syncopated quantity is supplied by the preceding syllable. In the former (prohibited) case the preceding syllable was ~, in the latter (permitted) case it was -. The former is prohibited because 'a pair of short syllables ... would have to supply the time value of the following short or anceps as well as the long which they "resolve" '.

I regard this as wishful theorising, based on an unproven premiss. The unproven premiss is that resolution is prohibited before syncopation. I have already argued (*Studies on the Text of Euripides* [1981] 18-20, 119) that it is not certain that any such prohibition exists. Cole devotes a footnote to me (p. 42 n. 36), in which he claims that, of the six tragic examples of resolution before syncopation which I called 'certain or very probable', only one (*E. Andr.* 1204-5 = 1219) 'is in a context that clearly calls for iambo-trochaic analysis, and there a lacuna in the antistrophe makes scansion uncertain'. Presumably my *OCT* (1984) appeared after he had written this. For, so far from positing a lacuna in the antistrophe, and so far from 'intruding molossus | dochmiac' in 1206, I accept Matthiae's deletion of 1206 (a deletion commended by M. W. Haslam, *CQ* n.s. 26 [1976] 8 n. 11, and in *Arktouros: Hellenic Studies presented to Bernard M.W. Knox* [1979] 96). Cole's reconstruction of the responding lines runs:

- - - . : ~ ~ ~ x : - - x : - - - . : - - ~ ~
= < - > - . : ~ ~ ~ x : - - - x : < - > - . : - - ~ ~ > .

I have added, for clarity, dotted lines which indicate where conventional colometry would mark metron-divisions; and I assume that, in the antepenultimate metron of the strophe, - ~ x is a misprint for - ~ - x (the book contains a myriad of misprints). Cole has produced syncopated trochaics, and in the antistrophe has posited not one lacuna but two. Since neither sense nor style demonstrably call for any addition at any point, this must be considered an uneconomical expedient. I am ready to acknowledge (as I did before [p. 119]) that many of the instances which I listed contain only cretics. But I adduced several candidates, which Cole does not discuss, containing metra other than cretics. And I draw particular attention to *E.Tr.* 1087 = 1105, which, if rightly emended, offers metre comparable to that which I postulate in *Andr.* 1204-5 = 1219. An alternative emendation (Wilamowitz's *τελχε' ἴνα* in 1087) has been commended by D. Sansone (*CPh* 79 [1984] 339). But this entails word-division after the long anceps of the iambic metron, for whose rarity see L.P.E. Parker, *CQ* n.s. 16 (1966) 12-20.

Take another passage where Cole has recourse to syncopation. The transmitted text of *E. Ba.* 148-50 (p. 48) becomes

~ ~ - . : - ~ - - | ~ ~ - . : ~ ~ - - | ~ ~ - . : ~ ~ - - : ~ ~ - x.

We have to wait until later (p. 100) to discover how Cole analyses the preceding line (147 ~ - - ~ -). Since a dochmiac is out of place, he analyses it as 'syncopated iambo-trochaic' (~ - . : - ~ -), which he regards as then being 'lengthened into succeeding ionic' (148 *ἐρεθίζων πλανήτας*, analysed as ~ ~ - . : - ~ -), against word-division, which articulates as ~ ~ - - : ~ - -). Set Murray's text of 147-9 against Cole's and recite them: *δροῦμι καὶ χοροῖς | ἐρεθίζων πλανήτας | ἰαχαῖς τ' ἀναπάλλων ~ δροῦμι καὶ χοροῖσιν | πλανήτας ἐρεθίζων ἰαχαῖς τ' ἀναπάλλων*. In which version does the ear detect rhythm? It detects it in the latter. The latter opens with two bacchiacs, which develop naturally out of the molossi prefixed to ionics in the two preceding lines; and, in the two lines which follow, bacchiac is prefixed to ionic (cf. *Alc.* 256 = 263, *Ph.* 1539, 1541, *IA* 171-2, *Hyps.* I.iv.2-3), and the rhythmical identity of the cola (note, incidentally, that *ἰαχαῖς* is now given its normal scansion) is fortified by concluding rhyme (*πλανήτας ἐρεθίζων | ἰαχαῖς τ' ἀναπάλλων*), for which technique see *Phaethon* 99n.. With the substitutions and syncopations of Cole the ear struggles to cope. Can it cope any better with his analysis of 150 (*τρυφερὸν πλόκαμον εἰς αἰθ :* ~ ~ - . : ~ ~ - -)? He alleges as parallels for this sequence *S. Ph.* 863 (the colometry which he attributes to modern editors is not the best colometry available, nor is it that of the latest

editor), E. Ph. 1517 (μονονότορος is corrupt, since there is no place here for a genitive [cf. D. J. Mastronarde, ZPE 38 (1980) 32-3]), El. 727 = 737 ('variously emended'), Or. 1483 (τότε δὴ τότε διαπρεπεῖς [- ~ - ~ : ~ ~ ~ -]), followed by ἐγένοντο Φρύγες δ' αὖτε Ἄρ- [- ~ - - : ~ ~ ~ -], with anomalous prosody). One begins to suspect that a theory is being pushed beyond the limit, in the aid of textual conservatism, to the credit of neither.

One of the merits which Cole claims for ἐπιπλοκή is that its interwoven or interlocking units often accord better with the indications of word-division. But what regularly emerges from Cole's analyses is a series of segments, which do indeed respect word-division, but which, so far from merging naturally with each other, are artificially marked off from each other by a mechanically artificial analysis. Liberal appeal to syncopation gives the segments a mutability of Protean proportions and sometimes produces a staccato effect. An extreme example is the analysis of E. Cycl. 657 (p. 84) σπεύδ' ἐκκαλεῖται τὸν ὀφρύν (- ~ - ~ || x - ~ ~ - ~ -) and 661 τόρνευ' ἔλκε, μή σ' ἐξοδυνῇ (- ~ - ~ : ~ - - ~ || x - ~ ~ - ~ -), where 'the chorus doubles and redoubles its efforts, and the rhythmical sequences it sings, brief as they are, require two inner breaks in the vocal line (|) for catching breath'. *Credat Iudaeus Apella, / non ego*.

A final surprise is sprung late in the book (pp. 213ff.): the notion (for which Cole finds support in a Hellenistic metrical treatise) of 'irrational' long syllables, 'longer than the normal short and shorter than the normal long', appearing in the trisyllabic segments ~ ~ ~ (iamb), ~ ~ ~ (trochee), - ~ - (cretic), and permitting such substitutions and responsions as x - ~ ~ ~ in an iambic metron and ~ ~ ~ - x and - ~ ~ ~ x in a trochaic metron, and cretic/anapaestic ~ ~ - and cretic/dactylic - ~ ~. He analyses E. Ba. 135-43 and 157-69 largely in terms of resolved cretics (- ~ ~), resolved trochees (~ ~ ~) and dactyls (- ~ ~). The analysis, for the most part, may be right. But it requires a blind leap of faith to accept the conclusion that 'the striking symmetry is in support of the assumption that the cretics, trochees and dactyls are here durational equivalents'. Table X (pp. 214-15) provides a series of passages, from a variety of authors, in which Cole detects such 'irrational' longs. I shall speak of only the Euripidean instances, of which there are some fourteen. What a rag-bag! Every one corrupt or explicable by alternative rational analysis. Take just two: Tr. 1069 = 1079 (- ~ ~ ~ ~), an analysis founded on Musgrave's πρωτόβολόν θ' for τε πρωτόβολον: why we should reject Musgrave's conjecture is explained by Fraenkel on A. Ag. 229f.); El. 459 = 471 - ~ ~ - ~ ~ as an iambic 'equivalent', with, in the antistrophe, word division in both of the resolved syllables (Cole nowhere refers to L. P. E. Parker, 'Split Resolution in Greek Dramatic Lyric', CQ n.s. 18 [1968] 241-69). A metrist who can call - ~ ~ - ~ ~ 'iambic' is talking a foreign language.

I have not exhausted the catalogue of licences. Cole believes in the possibility of responsion between syncopated and unsyncopated iambic and trochaic metra (p. 41). Here, indeed, he can appeal to the authority of West, *Greek Metre* 103-4, on whose candidates from tragedy I have commented in CR n.s. 34 (1984) 67. (At E. Or. 976 I should not now allege a dubiously resolved bacchiac, but should accept the probable reading of P. Oxy. 3716 τὸ δ.) Cole adds E. IA 253 = 265, where cautious editors accept Nauck's deletion of ἐκ in 265 (for the bare genitive see Kühner-Gerth 1. 394-5). Other licences are: anceps juxtaposed with anceps (e.g. E. Ion 503-4 [p. 83], where I do not understand Cole's punctuation); prosodic licences such as (p. 71) ὀρματ' ἐν (i.e. ὀρμαται elided), (p. 90) λιμναι (cf. Denniston and Page on A. Ag. 991), (p. 100 n. 105) ναίει, (p. 114 n. 127) γελῶντι προσώπων περιβαλεῖ βρόχον, (p. 176) ἀρχαῖος (tragedy has no instance of Attic correction of the diphthong αι when it takes the circumflex: cf. PCPS n.s. 20 [1974] 15 n. 7, *Dionysiaca: Nine Studies in Greek Poetry...presented to Sir Denys Page* [1978] 165). Division of Ion 220-1 (p. 204) between speakers gives (Chorus) θέμις γνάλων ὑπερβῆναι | λευκαῖ ποδὶ γ'... (Ion) οὐ θέμις, ὦ ξένη. (Chorus) οὐδόν;.... This is absurd: an answer given before a question is complete, and the question completed with a single word when the answer has been given.

Cole generally bases his analyses on the transmitted text, and all too often he ignores difficulties which have prompted editors to reject it. And yet he does offer many emendations of his own, in a variety of texts, usually without argument, and sometimes without signalling that they are his own emendations at all. I shall pass briefly in review his Euripidean emendations, ignoring some which have been anticipated. They betray a common feature: they aim to mend a fault, whether real or imaginary, of metre, and pay insufficient attention to context and style.

Ph. 1529 (p. 47) <διδυμ> οὐλόμεν'. Metre does not demand any supplement; and we do not want 'twin corpses' so soon after 'twin breasts'.

Ph. 1544 (p. 73) ξνερθ' for ξνερθεν. Elimination of the dochmiac is unnecessary, and is particularly undesirable if the preceding line is emended to give dochmiacs (as I have argued in *SIFC*, 1989).

Hi. 161 (p. 75 n. 70, p. 78) τᾶι deleted, without perceptible need or metrical advantage.

IT 440 (p. 86 n. 82) δι' δλα for 'Ελένα. A stylistically poor substitute for an unexceptionable word.

Ion 1234 (p. 94 n. 96) σταγόκιον. The surroundings are corrupt, and give no secure basis for Cole's metrical analysis.

Alc. 603 (p. 189) δγασθαι for δγαμαι. Metre does not call for any change; and this change entails the unwelcome expression πάντα ... κοφίας, which Dale's punctuation eliminates.

Alc. 400-2 (p. 189 n. 247) ἀντιάζω <ε>... πρὸς σε καλούμενος, cōc for ἀντιάζω ... καλοῦμαι (ε') ὁ cōc. But πρὸς σε (which ought to be πρὸς σε') καλούμενος cannot mean 'calling to you', if that is what it is designed to mean.

Hi. 552 (p. 191) φονοικ' ἰν > θ' ὑμεναίοις, giving responsion of ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ and ~ ~ ~ ~ ~, which Cole finds also in *S. El.* 123 = 139, where 'no convincing emendation has been suggested'. But it has: see T. C. W. Stinton, *JHS* 97 (1977) 128-9.

Alc. 215 (p. 196 n. 256) τίς ξξεισι, τίς... for ξξεισι τίς. But τίς ξξ- cannot respond to αλαῖ in 228: see G. Zuntz, *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides* (1965) 67.

Ba. 136 (p. 216 n. 299) πέσῃ <τις> or <τις> ἐρίπῃ. A mechanical shot in the dark (ἥριπον in any case is an epic aorist, not found in tragedy), and the appended discussion barely grazes the surface of the problems of this passage. For a helpful discussion of the problems see A. Henrichs in *Mnemosyne: Classical Studies in Memory of Karl K. Hulley* (ed. H. D. Evjen, 1984) 69-91.

My feelings, in reading this book, moved from admiration to exasperation, and back and forth, from exasperation to admiration, with a cyclical interweaving. And now I must return to the question which I posed earlier. Is Cole justified in his 'elevation of *epiplotke* to a cardinal principle of Greek versification'? That the principle may have at least a limited application, I readily agree. It is a useful term by which to gloss certain ambiguities which are perceptible in fairly simple rhythmical sequences. Greek poets wrote, in effect, in continuous prose, for the metrical units which they used were not divided, on the written page, until Alexandrian times. Whether the system of division into metrical units adopted by Aristophanes of Byzantium reflects truly, or approximately, or not at all, the units of composition in which they thought, we cannot know. But at least that system, as refined and rationalised by modern scholars, is a logical, coherent, and comprehensible system, which enables the ear to detect underlying and recurring patterns. Cole has performed a useful service, in showing that there are other possibilities, for understanding the ways in which writers of Greek lyric may have conceived and combined their units of composition, than are dreamt of in Aristophanes' colometry. But an editor must find the most convenient way of representing those units of composition on the page. And few editors will hesitate between the claims of colon and Cole.

W.Geoffrey Arnott (Leeds): KOPAZ

LCM 15.5 (May 1990), 80

It is generally recognised (cf. H.Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, I [Heidelberg 1961], 917; P.Lejeune, *Dictionnaire etymologique de la langue grecque*, I [Paris 1968], 565) that in ancient Greek κόραξ, the name of the raven (*Corvus corax*, Linnaeus) is an onomatopoeic formation, based on the bird's call and assimilated in its ending to other third-declension nouns in -αξ, -ακος. Less emphasis has been given to the fact that the final κ in the word's stem also in all probability takes its origin in the bird's call, of which the best ornithological description is given by H.F. Witheby and others, *The handbook of British birds*, I (London 1940), 8: 'usual flight note a repeated "pruk, pruk" . . . "greeting" notes to sitting female, a resonant "corronk".'

It is hardly remarkable that these sounds have independently given rise to the very similar name of the raven in the non-Indo-European Tibetan dialect spoken by the sherpas of the Himalayan regions of Nepal. 'The two ravens come to tritons on the gampa roof. *Gorawk*, *gorwak*, they croak, and this is the name given to them by the sherpas', writes P.Matthiessen, *The snow leopard* (London 1979), entry for 6 November. Compare R.L.Fleming, Sr, and others, *Birds of Nepal* (third edition, Kathmandu 1984), 174, identifying the bird as 'the "Gorax" of the sherpas'. Tibetan is classified as a member of the Tibeto-Himalayan branch of the Tibeto-Burmese subfamily of the Sino-Tibetan family of languages.



I am relieved to find that problems of type-setting (see the Editor's notes, LCM 15.4 [Apr.1990], 50) prevent me from producing the sherpa name in any of the three basic forms of Tibetan script.

Copyright © 1990 W.Geoffrey Arnott

C.J.Simpson (Wilfrid Laurier, Waterloo, Ontario): *The drama of Catullus 7*

LCM 15.5 (May 1990), 80

'Poem 7 is obviously connected with poem 5 . . .'. So T.Fear (LCM 15.2 [Feb.1990], 18-26, at 23). The author goes on to continue a worthy discussion of 'Catullus, a poet in transition'. He states that Lesbia 'has asked Catullus how many kisses he wants, and we may perhaps sense a note of impatience (if Catullus was successful in gaining the *basia mille* . . .)', and accepts a well worn distinction between urgent passion in poem 5 and an intellectual approach in poem 7.

I wonder, however, how much of that standard criticism is due to modern sensibilities. To be sure, 'Catullus' ultimate aim, as in poem 5, is passionate'. Why, then, accept that there is any removal from the immediacy of lust? It seems to me fairly demonstrable that poem 5 is equally the complex work of a *doctus poeta*.

Another matter: what is the significance of the indirect question *quaeris quot* . . . and the repeated phrase *satis superque / satis et super* (lines 2 and 10) in the series *quot . . . quam . . . quam . . . tam . . . quae*? Could these, *satis superque / satis et super*, not be Lesbia's own words thrown back at her by the poet?

Copyright © 1990 C.J.Simpson.